

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/741,669

Applicant(s)

FORSYTH ET AL.

Examiner

Frank W Lu

Art Unit

1634

**All Participants:**(1) Frank W Lu.(2) Mr. Daniel Hart (Reg. No. 40,637).**Status of Application:** after final rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 12 May 2003**Time:** 2 pm**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 first paragraph

Claims discussed:

45-56

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Hart asked to withdraw finality because applicant's amendment did not necessitate the new ground(s) of rejection presented in the final Office action. The examiner agreed to reconsider applicant's request after reviewing applicant's response. Relating to written description rejection, the examiner asked applicant to provide evidences showing that SEQ ID NO: 60 can be used as antisense nucleic acid. Mr. Hart argued that Examples 1-4 and Table 1 in the specification had provided enough written descriptions. The examiner will consult a senior examiner for this issue. Relating to enablement rejection, the examiner indicated that, since claim 45 did not limit cell type, if SEQ ID No: 60 can serve as an antisense nucleic acid, it was unclear whether this nucleic acid can serve as an antisense nucleic acid in any kind of cell type. The examiner asked that applicant either limited claim 45 to specific cell type or provided evidences to show that SEQ ID No: 60 can serve as an antisense in any kind of cell type.